

The arrival of back vowel fronting in New York City English

Bill Haddican, Sabrina Eliano, Daniel Yakubov
QC LVC Lab

Joint work with Cece Cutler, Michael Newman & Christina Tortora

QC Speech and Language Brown Bag
5/6/2019

Slides: tiny.cc/back-vowels

Vowel fronting in four lexical sets

- **Focus:** Back vowel fronting (BVF). In particular fronting of vowels in TOO, HOOP, GOAT and FOOT lexical sets.
- For /u/, three allophonic contexts distinguished.
 - i. TOO. Following coronals: *shoe*, *cue*.
 - ii. COOL. Preceding tautosyllabic /l/: *fool*, *pool*.
 - iii. HOOP. Elsewhere: *coop*, *goo*.
- For N. Am. at least, dialects obey an implicational hierarchy for allophonic contexts:
TOO > HOOP > COOL (Labov et al., 2005).
- Sometimes described as part of more general long-vowel fronting change including GOAT (Labov, 1994).
- Much less sharp allophonic difference for GOAT (Labov et al., 2005; Newman, 2014).

Diffusion of GOOSE/GOAT-fronting across English varieties

- UK varieties (Kerswill and Williams, 2005; Ferragne and Pellegrino, 2010; Haddican et al., 2013; Baranowski, 2014, 2017).
- N. Am. (Fought, 1999; Thomas, 2001; Fridland and Bartlett, 2006; Baranowski, 2008; Fridland, 2008; Hall-Lew, 2009; Koops, 2010; Podesva et al., 2015).




Figure 1: HOOP-fronting in N. Am. dialects. (Labov et al., 2005)

FOOT-fronting

- In some dialects described, BVF seems to apply only to long vowels, i.e. in GOOSE and GOAT sets (Labov, 1994; Labov et al., 2005).
- In some Western and Southern N. Am dialects, however, FOOT also fronts (Fridland and Bartlett, 2006; Eckert, 2008; Fridland, 2008; Hall-Lew, 2009; Podesva et al., 2015).




Figure 2: BVF in California Vowel Shift

Ethnicity

- Ethnic differentiation reported for some varieties.
- Fought (1999) reports some Chicanos not participating in GOOSE-fronting. (See also Godinez and Maddieson (1985).)
- African-American speakers sometimes reported to be behind Whites in fronting (Thomas, 2001; Fridland and Bartlett, 2006).
- Hall-Lew (2009), however, finds that San Francisco Asians participating in GOAT, GOOSE-fronting in a way very similar to SF Whites.

New York City English

- Newman (2014) reports fronting for TOO, particularly among Whites and Asians, and back variants in other contexts. (No controlled acoustic results reported.)
- Wong (2014) presents acoustic evidence suggesting HOOP fronting among Chinese Americans.
- Becker and Cogshall (2009) find no difference in fronting of nucleus for GOOSE between Af. Am. and White subjects.
- We are aware of no descriptions of fronting among Latinx groups.
- Traditional NYCE system reported to be conservative wrt GOAT (Labov et al., 2005; Newman, 2014).

Goals and main claims

- We describe an acoustic analysis of conversation data from 97 speakers recorded through the CoNYCE project (Tortora et al., in progress).
- *Two main claims:*
 - i. Fronting of vowels in TOO, HOOP, GOAT and FOOT lexical sets starting with speakers born > 1975.
 - ii. Unlike in changes in short-a contexts, BVF shows no strong effects of class. No ethnicity effects with possible exception of Caribbean Latinx groups.

Goals and main claims

- We describe an acoustic analysis of conversation data from 97 speakers recorded through the CoNYCE project (Tortora et al., in progress).
- *Two main claims:*
 - i. Fronting of vowels in TOO, HOOP, GOAT and FOOT lexical sets starting with speakers born > 1975.
 - ii. Unlike in changes in short-a contexts, BVF shows no strong effects of class. No ethnicity effects with possible exception of Caribbean Latinx groups.

Goals and main claims

- We describe an acoustic analysis of conversation data from 97 speakers recorded through the CoNYCE project (Tortora et al., in progress).
- *Two main claims:*
 - i. Fronting of vowels in TOO, HOOP, GOAT and FOOT lexical sets starting with speakers born > 1975.
 - ii. Unlike in changes in short-a contexts, BVF shows no strong effects of class. No ethnicity effects with possible exception of Caribbean Latinx groups.

Sample

- Data collected 2014-2019 as part of CoNYCE project (Tortora et al., in progress).
- 97 subjects, b. 1906-2001.
- 58 Women, 39 Men.




Figure 3: Subject home community

Sample

- Recordings transcribed and audio-aligned by student researchers, checked by research associates.
- 69,113 stressed vowels in four sets measured at 35% of duration using FAVE-Extract (Rosenfelder et al., 2014) and Prosodylab-Aligner (Gorman et al., 2011), via DARLA (Reddy and Stanford, 2015).
- Normalized using Watt & Fabricius' modified procedure (Fabricius et al., 2009).

A conservative back vowel system

- HOOP overlaps with COOL.
- Some fronting of TOO relative to back vowels.
- Back realizations for FOOT, GOAT.




Figure 4: John Stugots, Ital.-Am., b. 1959

A fronted system

- TOO close to FLEECE.
- Some fronting of HOOP relative to COOL.
- Some fronting of FOOT, GOAT relative to LOT, COOL.




Figure 5: Sarah Rodgers, Chin.-Am., b. 1999

A non-linear effect of age




Figure 6: Normalized F2 by subject birthyear and lexical set

Generality of changes

- A question to be addressed is whether this is a single process of fronting (Labov, 1994; Watt, 2000; Baranowski, 2008; Hall-Lew, 2009; Haddican et al., 2013).
- Labov's principle III: GOAT fronting parasitic on GOOSE fronting.
- For younger subset, moderate-strong correlation across lexical sets.
- Among older speakers, HOOP-correlates much more weakly, again suggesting different processes of change for two subsets.
- For latter, aggregate backing of GOAT, GOOSE, FOOT correlates across speakers.

By-speaker correlations across lexical sets




Figure 7: Spearman's ρ matrices for younger and older subjects.

A model of speakers born > 1975, N=55

Variable	Coeff.	St. Err.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Intercept	1.367	0.055	24.925	<.0001
Duration	0.110	0.037	2.932	.0034
Set:FOOT	-0.126	0.032	-3.912	<.0001
Set:GOAT	-0.315	0.021	-15.371	<.0001
Set:HOOP	-0.358	0.037	-9.600	<.0001
Age	-0.006	0.002	-3.551	.0008
Fol. sound([-Back])	0.013	0.006	2.112	.0347
Duration:FOOT	-0.922	0.144	-6.423	<.0001
Duration:GOAT	-0.164	0.042	-3.941	<.0001
Duration:HOOP	-0.245	0.081	-3.041	.0024

Table 1: Fixed effects from a model of F2. Reference level TOO for Set & [+Back] for Following Sound. Obs.=17,362.

(F2~Set*Duration+Age+Following sound+(Set|Speaker)+(1|Root))

Subjects born > 1975




Figure 8: Normalized F2 by subject birthyear and lexical set

Variation among young Latinx speakers




Figure 9: Left, Sophia Omelas, Latina, b. 1994. Right, Nicole Lopez, Latina, b. 1988.

Caribbean vs. Non-Caribbean Latinx Speakers




Figure 10: By-speaker random intercepts for GOAT and TOO.

Interim summary

- i. Fronting of TOO, HOOP, GOAT, FOOT beginning with subjects born >1975.
- ii. Among younger speakers, no effects of occupation or gender.
- iii. No strong ethnicity effects, but some evidence that Caribbean Latinx subjects lagging behind other groups.

Change in short-a

- A question that arises is whether BVF correlates across speakers with another innovation in NYCE, namely the loss of traditional set of tensing rules for short-a in favor of a nasal system.
- The complex set of tensing rules traditionally described for NYCE (the Tragerian system) appears to be undergoing simplification (Becker and Wong, 2010; Becker, 2010; Newman, 2014; Newlin-Łukowicz, 2015, 2016; Coggshall, 2017; Shapp, 2018).
- The nasal rule:
/æ/ → [tense]/ _____ [nasal]

Tragerian system

- Complex set of constraints (Trager, 1930; Labov, 1966, 1994, 2007; Becker, 2010).
- Lax unless followed by tautosyllabic:
 - Front nasals (*ham*, *hand*).
 - Voiced stops and affricates (*bag*, *badge*).
 - Voiceless fricatives (*math*, *fast*).
- Tense in syllables closed by inflectional morpheme boundaries (*planning*).

- Lax word-initially (with lexical exceptions, e.g. *ask*, *after*).

p	t	č	k
b	d	ǰ	g
m	n		ŋ
f	θ	s	š
v	ð	z	ž
		l	r

Figure 11: Tautosyllabic following sounds triggering tensing.

Change in short-a

- Previous results suggest that social conditions on short-a change are different from those on BVF. One is that short-a change, unlike BVF is strongly conditioned by Ethnicity, with non-whites leading the change (Becker, 2010; Becker and Wong, 2010; Haddican et al., 2018).
- Back vowels are also not prominent in dialect performances or metalinguistic representations of NYCE speech (Singler, 2017; Cutler, 2018).
- Short-a reorganization seems to have begun earlier, i.e. with speakers born before 1975 (Haddican et al., 2018). Considerable cross-speaker variability in /æ/ tensing for older speakers (Cogshall, 2017).

The demise of the Tragerian system




Figure 12: Mean F2-F1 by subject birthyear and tensing context.

Cross-speaker correlations with short-a change

- And indeed, there is a negligible cross speaker correlation between fronting TOO, GOAT and laxing LAUGH, BAN, BAG.
- The fact that BVF seems to be conditioned more weakly by ethnicity and class than THOUGHT-lowering and short-a laxing may reflect the former being indexically outcompeted (Wong and Hall-Lew, 2014).




Figure 13: Correlation matrix of by-speaker model estimate for six features for 43 speakers born > 1975.

Lexical effects at word and lemma level

- Lexical memory effects on phonetic production typically modeled as properties of word, less frequently as properties of lexical root/lemma (Gahl, 2008; Drager, 2011). The latter findings suggest there are phonetic correlates of lexical roots independent of effects for word and phoneme/category.
- Typical comparison used to see this are homophones, e.g. *time* ~ *thyme* and different categories of *like* (Gahl, 2008; Drager, 2011).
- Here we consider /o/-/u/ ablaut pairs, e.g. *throw-threw*.

Lexical effects at word and lemma level

- For older speakers in our sample (born ≤ 1975) there is TOO fronting without GOAT fronting.
- For these speakers, one might imagine that phonetic properties of one member of the ablaut pair is affected by its lexical relationship with the other member of the pair.
- Specifically, two expectations:
 - i. GOAT-items participating in an ablaut pair (*know*) might show some fronting relative to non-ablaut GOAT items (*no*).
 - ii. Conversely, for TOO, *knew* might show backing relative to *new*.
- **Pairs:** *throw-threw, know-knew, blow-blew, grow-grew, chose-choose, flow-flew, cold-cool, don't-do, move-motion.*

GOOSE-items




Figure 14: Random intercepts for word in model of /u/-fronting.

GOAT-items




Figure 15: Random intercepts for word in model of /o/-fronting.

Lemma-level effects

- Most contrasts headed in direction predicted, however:
 - i. In some cases, the data are sparse.
 - ii. Frequency not included as predictor in modeling.
 - iii. Most of the controls are non-homophones.

Main claims

Two main claims:

- i. BVF is here. Fronting of vowels in TOO, HOOP, GOAT and FOOT lexical sets starting with speakers born > 1975.
- ii. Unlike in changes in short-a contexts, BVF shows no strong effects of class. No ethnicity effects with possible exception of Caribbean Latinx groups.

Many thanks to ...

- Jim Stanford.
- Paul Foulkes.
- Smart, hard-working undergraduate collaborators at QC, CSI and Lehman.
- NSF (BCS-1630286, BCS-1152148).

References I

- Baranowski, M., 2008. The fronting of the back upgliding vowels in Charleston, South Carolina. *Language Variation and Change* 20, 527–551.
- Baranowski, M., 2014. The sociolinguistics of back vowel fronting in Manchester English. *Methods in Dialectology XV*, University of Groningen , 11–15.
- Baranowski, M., 2017. Class matters: The sociolinguistics of GOOSE and GOAT in Manchester English. *Language Variation and Change* 29, 301–339.
- Becker, K., 2010. Regional dialect features on the Lower East Side of New York City: Sociophonetics, ethnicity, and identity. Ph.D. thesis, New York University.
- Becker, K., Cogshall, E. L., 2009. The sociolinguistics of ethnicity in New York City. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 3, 751–766.
- Becker, K., Wong, A. W., 2010. The short-a system of New York City English: an update. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 15, 3.
- Cogshall, E. L., 2017. Short-a in the Sixth Borough: A Sociophonetic Analysis of a Complex Phonological System in Jersey City. Ph.D. thesis, New York University.
- Cutler, C., 2018. “Therez a lobsta in da refrigerator”: Metapragmatic representations of English in New York City, Talk given at CUNY.
- Drager, K. K., 2011. Sociophonetic variation and the lemma. *Journal of Phonetics* 39, 694–707.
- Eckert, P., 2008. Where do ethnolects stop? *International Journal of Bilingualism* 12, 25–42.
- Fabricius, A. H., Watt, D., Johnson, D. E., 2009. A comparison of three speaker-intrinsic vowel formant frequency normalization algorithms for sociophonetics. *Language Variation and Change* 21, 413–435.
- Ferragne, E., Pellegrino, F., 2010. Formant frequencies of vowels in 13 accents of the British Isles. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association* 40, 1–34.
- Fought, C., 1999. A majority sound change in a minority community:/u/-fronting in Chicano English. *Journal of sociolinguistics* 3, 5–23.

References II

- Fridland, V., 2008. Patterns of /uw/, /u/, and /ow/ fronting in Reno, Nevada. *American Speech* 83, 432–454.
- Fridland, V., Bartlett, K., 2006. The social and linguistic conditioning of back vowel fronting across ethnic groups in Memphis, Tennessee. *English Language & Linguistics* 10, 1–22.
- Gahl, S., 2008. Time and thyme are not homophones: The effect of lemma frequency on word durations in spontaneous speech. *Language* 84, 474–496.
- Godinez, M., Maddieson, I., 1985. Vowel differences between chicano and general californian english? *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 53, 43–58.
- Gorman, K., Howell, J., Wagner, M., 2011. Prosodylab-aligner: A tool for forced alignment of laboratory speech. *Canadian Acoustics* 39, 192–193.
- Haddican, B., Foulkes, P., Hughes, V., Richards, H., 2013. Interaction of social and linguistic constraints on two vowel changes in northern England. *Language Variation and Change* 25, 371–403.
- Haddican, B., Tortora, C., Newman, M., Cutler, C., Diertani, C. A., Eldridge, L., Sabrina, L., Tan, Z. Z. G., 2018. Systemic change and parent first-dialect effects in NYC English short-a variation. In: *NWAV* 47 talk.
- Hall-Lew, L., 2009. Ethnicity and phonetic variation in a San Francisco neighborhood. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.
- Kerswill, P., Williams, A., 2005. New towns and koineization: Linguistic and social correlates. *Linguistics* 43, 1023–1048.
- Koops, C., 2010. /u/-fronting is not monolithic: Two types of fronted/u/in Houston Anglos. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 16, 14.
- Labov, W., 1966. The social stratification of English in New York City. Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
- Labov, W., 1994. *Principles of Linguistic Change: Linguistic Factors*, Volume I. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

References III

- Labov, W., 2007. Transmission and diffusion. *Language* 83, 344–387.
- Labov, W., Ash, S., Boberg, C., 2005. The atlas of North American English: Phonetics, phonology and sound change. Walter de Gruyter.
- Newlin-Łukowicz, L., 2015. Ethnicity, L1 interference, and sound change in New York City. Ph.D. thesis, New York University.
- Newlin-Łukowicz, L., 2016. Co-occurrence of sociolinguistic variables and the construction of ethnic identities. *Lingua* 172, 100–115.
- Newman, M., 2014. New York City English. Walter de Gruyter.
- Podesva, R. J., D’Onofrio, A., Van Hofwegen, J., Kim, S. K., 2015. Country ideology and the California vowel shift. *Language Variation and Change* 27, 157–186.
- Reddy, S., Stanford, J., 2015. A web application for automated dialect analysis. In: Proceedings of the 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Demonstrations.
- Rosenfelder, I., Fruehwald, J., Evanini, K., Seyfarth, S., Gorman, K., Prichard, H., Yuan, J., 2014. Fave (forced alignment and vowel extraction). version 1.1.3 .
- Shapp, A., 2018. The short-a split in a suburban area of the New York City dialect region. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 3, 63–1.
- Singler, J., 2017. Extra, extra! How “Brooklynese” emerged as the term for NYC vernacular, talk given at CUNY.
- Thomas, E. R., 2001. An acoustic analysis of vowel variation in New World English. Publication of the American Dialect Society .
- Tortora, C., Cutler, C., Haddican, W., Newman, M., Santorini, B., Diertani, C. A., in progress. Corpus of New York City English (CUNY-CoNYCE). URL <https://conyce.commons.gc.cuny.edu/>.
- Trager, G. L., 1930. The pronunciation of “short a” in American standard English. *American Speech* 5, 396–400.

References IV

- Watt, D., 2000. Phonetic parallels between the close-mid vowels of Tyneside English: Are they internally or externally motivated? *Language Variation and Change* 12, 69–101.
- Wong, A. W.-m., 2014. Goose-fronting among Chinese Americans in New York City. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 20, 23.
- Wong, A. W.-m., Hall-Lew, L., 2014. Regional variability and ethnic identity: Chinese Americans in New York City and San Francisco. *Language & Communication* 35, 27–42.